arXiv:1301.4534v1 [math-ph] 19 Jan 2013

Discriminant of approximate nonlinear self-adjointenss and its applications

Zhi-Yong Zhang *

College of Sciences, North China University of Technology, Beijing 100144, P.R. China

Abstract: In this paper, we show that approximate nonlinear self-adjointness of perturbed PDEs is equivalent to nonlinear self-adjointness of the corresponding unperturbed PDEs, which provides a shortcut to discriminate approximate nonlinear self-adjointness. Moreover, a succinct approximate conservation law formula by virtue of the known conservation law of the unperturbed PDEs is given in a explicit form. We consider several examples to illustrate the results and to show that approximate nonlinear self-adjointness can generate new approximate conservation laws.

Keywords: Approximate nonlinear self-adjointness, Approximate conservation laws, Perturbed PDEs

1 Introduction

The discovery of conservation laws played a pivotal role in the comprehensive study of the properties and solutions of partial differential equations (PDEs) arising in many disciplines of the applied sciences including physical chemistry, fluid mechanics and etc. For example, the knowledge of conservation laws is useful in the numerical integration of PDEs such as controlling numerical errors. An infinite sequence of conserved densities is a predictor of the existence of solitons and complete integrability which means that the PDEs can be solved with the inverse scattering transform method [1]. Hence, in order to achieve these goals, one needs efficient methods to compute conservation laws.

The relationship between symmetry and conservation law provides a feasible method to construct conservation law of PDEs. The celebrated Noether theorem gave a systematic way to determine conservation laws for system of Euler-Lagrange equations which relied on the availability of a Lagrangian [2]. Later, new methods were proposed which pose less restrictions on the knowledge of Lagrangian. Kara and Mahomed presented a partial Noether approach for Euler-Lagrange type equations [5]. In [3, 4], Anco and Bluman proposed multiplier method to construct local conservation laws for PDEs expressed in a standard Cauchy-Kovalevskaya form, which did not count on the existence of Lagrangian. Recently, Ibragimov suggested the general concept of nonlinear self-adjointness for constructing conservation laws which embraces strict self-adjointness, qusi self-adjointness

---

[*] E-mail: zhiyong-2008@163.com; Tel:+86 010 88803103

and weak self-adjointness stated earlier and these methods have exerted effectiveness when applying to some physical PDEs [6–12].

On the other hand, combination of symmetry group theory and perturbation analysis techniques leads to emergence of approximate symmetry which aims to study perturbed PDEs possessing few exact symmetries [14, 15], thus it is natural to extend the above procedures for usual PDEs to handle approximate conservation laws associated with approximate symmetry. In [16], Kara, Mahomed and Ünal studied how to construct approximate conservation laws for perturbed PDEs via approximate Lie-Bäcklund symmetries. In [17], a basis of approximate conservation laws for perturbed PDEs was discussed. Johnpillai et.al [18] showed how to construct approximate conservation laws of approximate Euler-type equations via approximate Noether type symmetry operators associated with partial Lagrangian. Quite recently, we introduced the notion of approximate nonlinear self-adjointness and studied its properties to construct approximate conservation laws which extends the results in unperturbed case [19].

The purpose of this paper is to study how to discriminate approximate nonlinear self-adjointness of perturbed PDEs besides the definition. We show that approximate nonlinear self-adjointness of perturbed PDEs is equivalent to nonlinear self-adjointness of the corresponding unperturbed PDEs. We also give a specific approximate conservation law formula by virtue of the known conservation law of the unperturbed PDEs.

The outline of the paper is arranged as follows. In Section 2, some related basic notions and principles are reviewed and the main results are given. In Section 3, several examples are considered to illustrate the results. The last section contains a conclusion and discussion.

2 Main results

In this section, we first recall some notions and principles related with approximate nonlinear self-adjointness, and then give the main results of the paper.

2.1 Preliminaries

2.1.1 Notations

We first define some notations which will be used throughout the paper.

Let $x = (x^1, \dots, x^n)$ be independent variables and $u = (u^1, \dots, u^m)$, $v = (v^1, \dots, v^m)$ and $w = (w^1, \dots, w^m)$ as three dependent variable sets, $\phi(x, u) = (\phi^1, \dots, \phi^m), \psi(x, u) = (\psi^1, \dots, \psi^m)$ and $\varphi(x, u) = (\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^m)$ be three m-dimensional vector functions, whose different order derivatives are denoted as follows

$$\Lambda_{(1)} = \{\Lambda^\sigma_{i_1}\}, \quad \Lambda_{(2)} = \{\Lambda^\sigma_{i_1 i_2}\}, \quad \dots, \quad \Lambda_{(r)} = \{\Lambda^\sigma_{i_1 \dots i_r}\},$$

where $\Lambda^\sigma_{i_1 \dots i_s} = D_{i_1} D_{i_2} \dots D_{i_s}(\Lambda^\sigma)$ and $\sigma = 1, 2, \dots, m$. The symbol "Λ" denotes the dependent variables u, v, w and vector functions ϕ, ψ, φ. Hereinafter, D_i denotes the total derivative operators with respect to x^i. For example, for one dependent variable

$u = u(x,t)$ with $x = x^1, t = x^2$, one has

$$D_x = \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + u_x \frac{\partial}{\partial u} + u_{xx} \frac{\partial}{\partial u_x} + u_{xt} \frac{\partial}{\partial u_t} + \ldots.$$

2.1.2 Approximate nonlinear self-adjointness

Consider a system of m PDEs with rth-order

$$E_\alpha = E_\alpha^0(x, u, u_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)}) + \epsilon E_\alpha^1(x, u, u_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)}) = 0, \tag{1}$$

where ϵ is a small parameter and $\alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, m$. System (1) is called perturbed PDEs while the system which do not contain the perturbed term $\epsilon E_\alpha^1(x, u, u_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)})$ in the form

$$E_\alpha^0(x, u, u_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)}) = 0, \tag{2}$$

is named by unperturbed PDEs. Note that the summation convention for repeated indices is used throughout the paper if no special notations are added.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the formal Lagrangian of system (2) given by

$$\mathcal{L} = v^\beta E_\beta^0(x, u, u_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)}), \tag{3}$$

then the adjoint equations of system (2) are defined by

$$(E_\alpha^0)^*(x, u, v, u_{(1)}, v_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)}, v_{(r)}) = \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta u^\sigma} = 0, \tag{4}$$

where $\delta/\delta u^\sigma$ is Euler-Lagrange operator written as

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta u^\sigma} = \frac{\partial}{\partial u^\sigma} + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (-1)^s D_{i_1} \ldots D_{i_s} \frac{\partial}{\partial u^\sigma_{i_1 \ldots i_s}}. \tag{5}$$

Definition 2.1 *(Nonlinear self-adjointness [6]) The system (2) is said to be nonlinearly self-adjoint if the adjoint system (4) is satisfied for all solutions u of system (2) upon a substitution*

$$v^\sigma = \varphi^\sigma(x, u), \qquad \sigma = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{6}$$

such that $\varphi(x, u) \neq 0$.

Here, $\varphi(x, u) \neq 0$ means that not all elements of $\varphi(x, u)$ equal zero. Definition 2.1 is also equivalent to the following identities holding for the undetermined coefficients (or functions) λ_α^β

$$(E_\alpha^0)^*(x, u, v, u_{(1)}, v_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)}, v_{(r)})_{|\{v=\varphi, \ldots, v_{(r)}=\varphi_{(r)}\}} = \lambda_\alpha^\beta E_\beta^0(x, u, u_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)}), \tag{7}$$

or equivalent form $[\delta(v^\beta E^0_\beta)/\delta u^\sigma]_{|\{v=\varphi,\ldots,v_{(r)}=\varphi_{(r)}\}} = \lambda^\beta_\alpha E^0_\beta$, which is applicable in the computations.

In [19], we extended the above procedures to deal with perturbed PDEs. The formal Lagrangian $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}$ of perturbed system (1) is given by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} = w^\beta[E^0_\beta(x, u, u_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)}) + \epsilon\, E^1_\beta(x, u, u_{(1)}, \cdots, u_{(r)})],$$

then the adjoint equations of system (1) are written as

$$E^*_\alpha(x, u, w, u_{(1)}, w_{(1)}, \ldots, u_{(r)}, w_{(r)}) = \frac{\delta\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}}{\delta u^\sigma} = 0. \tag{8}$$

Definition 2.2 *(Approximate nonlinear self-adjointness [19]) The perturbed system (1) is called approximate nonlinear self-adjointness if the adjoint system (8) is approximate satisfied for all solutions u of system (1) upon a substitution*

$$w^\sigma = \psi^\sigma(x, u) + \epsilon\phi^\sigma(x, u), \qquad \sigma = 1, \ldots, m, \tag{9}$$

such that not all ψ^σ and ϕ^σ are identically equal to zero.

Definition 2.2 extends the results of unperturbed case and is equivalent to the following identity with undetermined parameters (or functions) λ^β_α and μ^β_α,

$$\begin{aligned} &E^*_\alpha(x, u, w, u_{(1)}, w_{(1)}, \ldots, u_{(r)}, w_{(r)})_{|\{w=\psi+\epsilon\phi,\ldots,w_{(r)}=\psi_{(r)}+\epsilon\phi_{(r)}\}} \\ &\quad - \left[(\lambda^\beta_\alpha + \epsilon\mu^\beta_\alpha)E^0_\beta(x, u, u_{(1)}, \ldots, u_{(r)}) + \epsilon\lambda^\beta_\alpha E^1_\beta(x, u, u_{(1)}, \ldots, u_{(r)})\right] = O(\epsilon^2), \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

which provides a computable equality for approximate nonlinear self-adjointness of perturbed PDEs.

Definition 2.3 *(Approximate conservation law [20]) The vector $T = (T^1, T^2, \ldots T^n)$ defined by $T^i = T^i_0 + \epsilon T^i_1 + \cdots + \epsilon^k T^i_k$ is an approximate conserved vector of system (1) if T^i satisfies approximate equation $D_i T^i = O(\epsilon^{k+1})$ for all solutions of system (1), which defines a kth-order approximate conservation law.*

The major consideration of the paper concentrates on the first-order approximate conservation law which is defined as $D_i T^i = O(\epsilon^2)$ with $T^i = T^i_0 + \epsilon T^i_1$.

The following theorem will be used to construct conservation laws for both unperturbed and perturbed cases [21].

Theorem 2.4 *Any infinitesimal symmetry (Lie point, Lie-Bäcklund, nonlocal)*

$$X = \xi^i(x, u, u_{(1)}, \ldots)\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i} + \eta^\sigma(x, u, u_{(1)}, \ldots)\frac{\partial}{\partial u^\sigma}$$

of system (2) leads to a conservation law $D_i(C^i) = 0$ *constructed by the formula*

$$C^i = \xi^i \mathcal{K} + W^\sigma \Big[\frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial u_i^\sigma} - D_j(\frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial u_{ij}^\sigma}) + D_j D_k(\frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial u_{ijk}^\sigma}) - \ldots\Big]$$
$$+D_j(W^\sigma)\Big[\frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial u_{ij}^\sigma} - D_k(\frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial u_{ijk}^\sigma}) + \ldots\Big] + D_j D_k(W^\sigma)\Big[\frac{\partial \mathcal{K}}{\partial u_{ijk}^\sigma} - \ldots\Big] + \ldots, \quad (11)$$

where $W^\sigma = \eta^\sigma - \xi^j u_j^\sigma$ *and* $\mathcal{K}$ *is the formal Lagrangian.*

Generally speaking, the term $\xi^i \mathcal{K}$ with $\mathcal{K}$ in the form (3) can be omitted because it vanishes identically on the solution manifold of the studying PDEs.

The following properties about approximate nonlinear self-adjointness of perturbed PDEs will be used in the proof of the main results in Subsection 2.2.

Theorem 2.5 *[19] If adjoint system (4) has solutions in the form* $v^\sigma = \epsilon f^\sigma(x, u)$ *with some functions* $f^\sigma(x, u)$*, then system (1) is approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint.*

2.2 Main results

In this subsection, we give the following discriminant criterion of approximate nonlinear self-adjointness for perturbed PDEs by means of nonlinear self-adjointness of the corresponding unperturbed PDEs.

Theorem 2.6 *Perturbed system (1) is approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint if and only if unperturbed system (2) is nonlinearly self-adjoint.*

Proof. (⇐). If system (2) is nonlinearly self-adjoint, then by Definition 2.1, for all solutions u of system (2), there exists a substitution $v^\sigma = \varphi^\sigma(x, u)$ which are solutions of adjoint equations (4), such that $\varphi(x, u) \neq 0$. Since adjoint system (4) is linear in v and its derivatives, thus $\epsilon v^\sigma = \epsilon \varphi^\sigma(x, u)$ also satisfy equations (4). Then by Theorem 2.5, system (1) is approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint.

(⇒). Conversely, if perturbed system (1) is approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint, then by Definition 2.2, there exists a nontrivial substitution $w^\sigma = \psi^\sigma(x, u) + \epsilon \phi^\sigma(x, u)$ such that equality (10) holds.

Observe that $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{L} + \epsilon w^\beta E_\beta^1$, then system (8) becomes

$$\frac{\delta \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}}{\delta u^\sigma} = \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta u^\sigma} + \epsilon \frac{\delta (w^\beta E_\beta^1)}{\delta u^\sigma}. \quad (12)$$

Here, $\mathcal{L} = w^\beta E_\beta^0$ is identical to Eq.(3) except for the introduced variables v^β and w^β. Inserting (12) and $w^\sigma = w_0^\sigma(x, u) + \epsilon w_1^\sigma(x, u)$ into (10), that is

$$\frac{\delta (w_0^\beta E_\beta^0)}{\delta u^\sigma}_{|w_0=\psi} + \epsilon \Big[\frac{\delta (w_0^\beta E_\beta^1)}{\delta u^\sigma}_{|w_0=\psi} + \frac{\delta (w_1^\beta E_\beta^0)}{\delta u^\sigma}_{|w_1=\phi}\Big] - \big[(\lambda_\alpha^\beta + \epsilon \mu_\alpha^\beta) E_\beta^0 + \epsilon \lambda_\alpha^\beta E_\beta^1\big] = O(\epsilon^2),$$

and separating it with respect to the perturbed parameter ϵ up to first degree, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon^0 : \quad & \frac{\delta(w_0^\beta E_\beta^0)}{\delta u^\sigma}_{|w_0=\psi} = \lambda_\alpha^\beta E_\beta^0,\\ \epsilon^1 : \quad & \frac{\delta(w_0^\beta E_\beta^1)}{\delta u^\sigma}_{|w_0=\psi} + \frac{\delta(w_1^\beta E_\beta^0)}{\delta u^\sigma}_{|w_1=\phi} = \mu_\alpha^\beta E_\beta^0 + \lambda_\alpha^\beta E_\beta^1. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Obviously, the first equation in (13) is just the required condition (7) for nonlinear self-adjointness of unperturbed PDEs.

We prove sufficiency by contradiction. Assume that system (2) is not nonlinearly self-adjoint, that means the first equation in (13) has no nontrivial solutions, i.e., $\psi(x,u)=0$, then $\lambda_\alpha^\beta = 0$ due to $E_\beta^0 \neq 0$. Since $\delta(\psi^\beta E_\beta^1)/\delta u^\sigma$ is linear in ψ and their derivatives, thus $\delta(\psi^\beta E_\beta^1)/\delta u^\sigma = 0$ and the second equation becomes

$$\frac{\delta(w_1^\beta E_\beta^0)}{\delta u^\sigma}_{|w_1=\phi} = \mu_\alpha^\beta E_\beta^0. \tag{14}$$

System (14) has the same form as the first equation in (13) and also only has zero solutions $\phi(x,u)=0$, thus the required substitution $w^\sigma = \psi^\sigma(x,u) + \epsilon\phi^\sigma(x,u) = 0$, that means system (1) is not approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint, which is a contradiction. Hence, unperturbed PDEs (2) must be nonlinearly self-adjoint. It proves the theorem. ■

Theorem 2.6 provides a shortcut to discriminate approximate nonlinear self-adjointness of perturbed PDEs. It attributes approximate nonlinear self-adjointness of perturbed PDEs to nonlinear self-adjointness of its corresponding unperturbed system. For the perturbed PDEs sharing the same unperturbed PDEs, we have the following results.

Corollary 2.7 *If the unperturbed PDEs are not nonlinearly self-adjoint, then the perturbed system consisting of unperturbed PDEs with any perturbed terms are not approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint.*

In what follows, based on Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 2.6, we give a specific approximate conservation law formula by means of the conservation laws of unperturbed system (2), which simplify the computations of first-order approximate conservation laws of perturbed system (1).

Theorem 2.8 *Let $X = X_0 + \epsilon X_1$ be a first-order approximate symmetry generator of perturbed system (1), where $X_0 = \xi_0^i \partial_{x^i} + \eta_0^\sigma \partial_{u^\sigma}, X_1 = \xi_1^i \partial_{x^i} + \eta_1^\sigma \partial_{u^\sigma}$ and the substitution for approximate nonlinear self-adjointness is $w^\sigma = \psi^\sigma + \epsilon\phi^\sigma(x,u)$. If $C = (C^1, \dots, C^n)$ is a conserved vector of unperturbed system (2) obtained by formula (11), then a first-order approximate conservation law $D_i(T^i) = O(\epsilon^2)$ of perturbed system (1) is given by the formula*

$$\begin{aligned} T^i = C^i_{|v=w} + \epsilon\Big[& \xi_0^i \mathcal{L}_1 + W_0^\sigma \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_1}{\delta u_i^\sigma} + D_j(W_0^\sigma)\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_1}{\delta u_{ij}^\sigma} + D_j D_k(W_0^\sigma)\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_1}{\delta u_{ijk}^\sigma} + \dots \\ & + \xi_1^i \mathcal{L}_2 + W_1^\sigma \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_2}{\delta u_i^\sigma} + D_j(W_1^\sigma)\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_2}{\delta u_{ij}^\sigma} + D_j D_k(W_1^\sigma)\frac{\delta \mathcal{L}_2}{\delta u_{ijk}^\sigma} + \dots \Big]_{|w_0=\psi}, \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $W_0^\sigma = \eta_0^\sigma - \xi_0^j u_j^\sigma$, $W_1^\sigma = \eta_1^\sigma - \xi_1^j u_j^\sigma$ *and* $\mathcal{L}_1 = w_0^\beta E_\beta^1, \mathcal{L}_2 = w_0^\beta E_\beta^0$. *The Euler-Lagrange operators with respect to derivatives of* u^σ *are obtained from (5) by replacing* u^σ *by the corresponding derivatives, e.g.*

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta u_i^\sigma} = \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i^\sigma} + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (-1)^s D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_s} \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{ii_1 \dots i_s}^\sigma}.$$

Proof. Observe that in conservation law formula (11), the symbols are represented as follows:

$$W^\sigma = W_0^\sigma + \epsilon W_1^\sigma, \quad \mathcal{K} = \mathcal{L} + \epsilon w^\beta E_\beta^1,$$

thus direct computations lead to the theorem where the second-order terms of ϵ are omitted. ■

Remark 2.9 *In Theorem 2.8, the conservation law* $D_i(C^i) = 0$ *is calculated via the substitution* $v^\sigma = \varphi^\sigma(x, u)$ *on the solution manifold of system (2). The approximate conservation law* $D_i(T^i) = O(\epsilon^2)$ *is obtained by formula (15) evaluated on the solution manifold of perturbed system (1), where* $w^\sigma = \psi^\sigma + \epsilon \phi^\sigma(x, u)$ *and* $v^\sigma = \varphi^\sigma(x, u)$.

Theorem 2.8 provides a shortcut to construct approximate conservation laws if the studied perturbed system consisting of two or more perturbed PDEs have the same unperturbed system. It means that if unperturbed system (2) has a conservation law, then the formula (15) in Theorem 2.8 gives a direct computable formula of first-order approximate conservation laws for perturbed system (1). Furthermore, the approach of approximate symmetry definitely extends symmetry scope of perturbed PDEs [14, 15], thus approximate nonlinear self-adjointness can generate new approximate conservation laws which cannot be obtain by nonlinear self-adjointness.

3 Applications

We illustrate our results by considering some examples from the literatures. Note that the approximate symmetries used to construct approximate conservation laws are obtained by the method originated from Baikov et.al [14].

Example 1. Perturbed nonlinear wave equation

The first example is to study a class of perturbed nonlinear wave equations

$$u_{tt} + \epsilon u_t = [F(u) u_x]_x, \quad F'(u) \neq 0, \tag{16}$$

where $F(u)$ is an arbitrary smooth function. Eq.(16) describes wave phenomena in shallow water, long radio engineering lines and isentropic motion of a fluid in a pipe [14, 23]. In [14, 24], two types of approximate symmetry methods were applied to Eq.(16) and approximate symmetry classifications and reductions are performed. Approximate conservation laws are considered via approximate nonlinear self-adjointness in [19].

There exist two ways to investigate approximate nonlinear self-adjointness of Eq.(16). The first method is based on Definition 2.2 which is performed in [19], here, we recall the conclusion and use Theorem 2.6 to explore approximate nonlinear self-adjointness of Eq.(16).

Proposition 3.1 *[19] Eq.(16) is approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint under the substitution*

$$w = (c_1 t + c_2)x + c_3 t + c_4 + \epsilon\Big[(\frac{1}{2}c_1 t^2 + c_5 t + c_6)x + \frac{1}{2}c_3 t^2 + c_7 t + c_8\Big], \tag{17}$$

where $c_i, (i = 1, \dots, 8)$ are arbitrary constants such that $w \neq 0$.

Proof: In [6], the authors showed that the unperturbed equation of Eq.(16)

$$u_{tt} - [F(u)u_x]_x = 0, \tag{18}$$

is nonlinearly self-adjoint upon a substitution $v = c_1 xt + c_2 x + c_3 t + c_4$ with arbitrary parameter $c_i(i = 1, \dots, 4)$, thus by Theorem 2.6, Eq.(16) is approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint. This completes the proof. ■

Example 2. Two perturbed wave equations having same unperturbed equation

Consider the classical wave equation in one dimension

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} = 0, \tag{19}$$

which describes undamped linear waves in an isotropic medium. Obviously, Eq.(19) is nonlinearly self-adjoint via a substitution $v = c_1 u + f(x,t)$, where f satisfies $f_{tt} - f_{xx} = 0$. Hence, with the help of formula (11), we obtain conservation law formula

$$\begin{aligned} C^t &= \xi_0^t v(u_{tt} - u_{xx}) - v_t W_0 + v D_t(W_0), \\ C^x &= \xi_0^x v(u_{tt} - u_{xx}) + v_x W_0 - v D_x(W_0), \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where the infinitesimal operator $X_0 = \xi_0^t \partial_t + \xi_0^x \partial_x + \eta_0 \partial_u$ leaves Eq.(19) invariant and, hereinafter, $W_0 = \eta_0 - \xi_0^x u_x - \xi_0^t u_t$.

The two perturbed wave equations, which are Eq.(19) together with two perturbed terms, are in the form

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} + \epsilon u_t = 0, \tag{21}$$

and

$$u_{tt} - u_{xx} + \epsilon(u u_t + \frac{1}{2}t u_t^2 - \frac{1}{2}t u_x^2) = 0, \tag{22}$$

whose approximate conservation laws are studied in [16,22] via partial Lagrangian method. Since Eq.(19) is nonlinearly self-adjoint, thus by Theorem 2.6, both Eq.(21) and (22) are approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint. In particular, we have the following results.

Proposition 3.2 *1. Eq.(21) is approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint upon a substitution*

$w=c_1u+h+\epsilon(c_1tu+c_2u+k)$, where arbitrary functions $h(x,t)$ and $k(x,t)$ solve $h_{tt}-h_{xx}=0, k_{tt}-k_{xx}-h_t=0$.

2. Eq.(22) is approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint upon a substitution $w=c_1u+f+\epsilon(\frac{3}{4}c_1tu^2+\frac{1}{2}tfu+g)$ with functions $f(x,t)$ and $g(x,t)$ satisfying Eq.(19).

Proof: We prove the second result while the first one can be done with similar procedure.

Let the formal Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}=w[u_{tt}-u_{xx}+\epsilon(uu_t+\frac{1}{2}tu_t^2-\frac{1}{2}tu_x^2)]$, then the adjoint equation is $\delta\mathcal{L}/\delta u=w_{tt}-w_{xx}-\epsilon[(uw)_t+t(u_tw)_t-t(u_xw)_x]$. Assume that the substitution is in the form $w=\psi(x,t,u)+\epsilon\phi(x,t,u)$ and should satisfy equality (10), in this case, it becomes

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big[w_{tt}-w_{xx}-\epsilon[(uw)_t+t(u_tw)_t-t(u_xw)_x]\Big]_{|w=\psi(x,t,u)+\epsilon\phi(x,t,u)}\\&\qquad=(\lambda_0+\epsilon\mu_0)[u_{tt}-u_{xx}]+\epsilon\lambda_0(uu_t+\frac{1}{2}tu_t^2-\frac{1}{2}tu_x^2),\end{aligned}\tag{23}$$

where we omit the terms containing ϵ^2.

The reckoning shows that $\psi(x,t,u),\phi(x,t,u)$ and the undetermined function λ_0,μ_0 satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}&\psi_{uu}=\psi_{xu}=\psi_{tu}=0,\\&\psi_u=\lambda_0,\psi_{tt}-\psi_{xx}=0,\\&\phi_u-\mu_0-t\psi=0,\ 2\phi_{uu}-2t\psi_u-\lambda_0t=0,\\&2\phi_{tu}-\psi_uu+\psi+t\psi_t-\lambda_0u=0,\ 2\phi_{xu}-t\psi_x=0,\ \phi_{tt}-\phi_{xx}-u\psi_t=0.\end{aligned}\tag{24}$$

Solving system (24) gives $\psi=c_1u+f,\phi=\frac{3}{4}c_1tu^2+\frac{1}{2}tfu+g$ and $\lambda_0=c_1,\mu_0=\frac{1}{2}c_1tu-\frac{1}{2}tf$. It proves the second result. ■

Next, we construct approximate conservation laws by means of Theorem 2.8.

Approximate conservation law for Eq.(21): By means of the substitution $w=c_1u+h+\epsilon(\frac{1}{2}c_1tu+c_2u+k)$ and formula (15), we obtain first-order approximate conservation law of Eq.(21)

$$\begin{aligned}T^t_{(21)}&=C^t_{|v=w}+\epsilon\left[\xi^t_0wu_t+wW_0-w_tW_1+wD_t(W_1)\right],\\T^x_{(21)}&=C^x_{|v=w}+\epsilon\big[\xi^x_0wu_t+w_xW_1-wD_x(W_1)\big],\end{aligned}\tag{25}$$

with the first-order approximate infinitesimal operator $X=X_0+\epsilon X_1=X_0+\epsilon(\xi^t_1\partial_t+\xi^x_1\partial_x+\eta_1\partial_u)$ admitted by Eq.(21) and $W_1=\eta_1-\xi^x_1u_x-\xi^t_1u_t$.

In particular, consider an approximate symmetry $X=\partial_t+\epsilon(-\frac{1}{2}u\partial_u)$, then $\xi^t_0=1,\xi^x_0=0,W_0=-u_t,W_1=-\frac{1}{2}u$, thus an approximate conservation law is

$$\begin{aligned}T^t_{(21)}&=u_tw_t-u_{xx}w+\epsilon\Big[\frac{1}{2}uw_t-\frac{1}{2}u_tw\Big],\\T^x_{(21)}&=-u_tw_x+wu_{xt}+\epsilon\Big[\frac{1}{2}u_xw-\frac{1}{2}uw_x\Big].\end{aligned}\tag{26}$$

Induced by one approximate operator $X = \partial_t + \epsilon(-\frac{1}{2}u\partial_u)$, formula (26) provides more approximate conservations laws via substitution $w = c_1u + f + \epsilon(\frac{1}{2}c_1tu + c_2u + g)$ which includes the approximate conservation law in [22]. In particular, let $w = \frac{1}{2}u + \epsilon\frac{1}{2}tu$, then after proper arrangements, conservation law (26) becomes

$$T^t_{(21)} = \frac{1}{2}u_t^2 + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon\Big[tu_t^2 + uu_t + tu_x^2\Big], \ \ T^x_{(21)} = -u_xu_t - \epsilon\Big[\frac{1}{2}uu_x + tu_xu_t\Big],$$

which coincides with the results in [22] up to some so-called gauge terms stated there.

Approximate conservation law for Eq.(22): For Eq.(22), with a substitution $w = c_1u + f + \epsilon(\frac{3}{4}c_1tu^2 + \frac{1}{2}tfu + g)$ with f, g satisfying Eq.(19), one has

$$\begin{aligned} T^t_{(22)} &= C^t_{|v=w} + \epsilon\Big[\xi_0^t(uu_t + \frac{1}{2}tu_t^2 - \frac{1}{2}tu_x^2)w + (uw + tu_tw)W_0 - w_t\widetilde{W}_1 + wD_t(\widetilde{W}_1)\Big], \\ T^x_{(22)} &= C^x_{|v=w} + \epsilon\Big[\xi_0^x(uu_t + \frac{1}{2}tu_t^2 - \frac{1}{2}tu_x^2)w - tu_xwW_0 + w_x\widetilde{W}_1 - wD_x(\widetilde{W}_1)\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

with the first-order approximate infinitesimal operator $\widetilde{X} = X_0 + \epsilon\widetilde{X}_1 = X_0 + \epsilon(\widetilde{\xi}_1^t\partial_t + \widetilde{\xi}_1^x\partial_x + \widetilde{\eta}_1\partial_u)$ admitted by Eq.(22) and $\widetilde{W}_1 = \widetilde{\eta}_1 - \widetilde{\xi}_1^xu_x - \widetilde{\xi}_1^tu_t$.

For example, consider an approximate Lie point symmetry $\widetilde{X} = \partial_u + \epsilon(-\frac{1}{2}tu\partial_u)$, it means $\xi_0^t = \xi_0^x = 0, W_0 = 1, \widetilde{W}_1 = -\frac{1}{2}tu$, then by (20) and (27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T^t_{(22)} &= -w_t + \epsilon\Big[\frac{1}{2}tw_tu + \frac{1}{2}w(u + tu_t)\Big], \\ T^x_{(22)} &= w_x - \epsilon\Big[\frac{1}{2}twu_x + \frac{1}{2}tuw_x\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Similarly, with substitution $w = c_1u + f + \epsilon(\frac{3}{4}c_1tu^2 + \frac{1}{2}tfu + g)$, formula (28) also gives more approximate conservations laws generated by the approximate operator $\widetilde{X} = \partial_u + \epsilon(-\frac{1}{2}tu\partial_u)$. Let $w = u + \epsilon\frac{3}{4}tu^2$, then (28) becomes

$$T^t_{(22)} = -u_t - \epsilon\Big[\frac{1}{2}tuu_t + \frac{1}{4}u^2\Big], \ \ T^x_{(22)} = u_x + \epsilon\Big[\frac{1}{2}tuu_x\Big],$$

which coincides with the results in [22].

Both Eq.(21) and Eq.(22) share the same unperturbed equation (19), thus formula (15) provides a direct and simple way to obtain approximate conservation law based on the known conservation laws (20) of Eq.(19). Moreover, the new formulae produce new approximate conservation laws than the results stated in the previous literatures.

4 Conclusion and discussion

We propose a succinct approach to discriminate approximate nonlinear self-adjointness by means of nonlinear self-adjointness of the corresponding unperturbed PDEs. Consequently, a approximate conservation law formula is given based on the known conservation laws of the unperturbed PDEs, especially effective for the system containing two or more perturbed PDEs and sharing the same unperturbed PDEs. The results are applied to several linear and nonlinear perturbed nonlinear wave equations and approximate conservation laws are obtained.

In addition, we consider the short pulse equation

$$u_{xt} = u + \frac{1}{6}(u^3)_{xx}, \tag{29}$$

which was suggested in [25] as a mathematical model for the propagation of ultra-short light pulses in media with nonlinearities. Eq.(29) is not nonlinearly self-adjoint with substitution $\varphi = \varphi(x, t, u)$ [6]. Thus, by Theorem 2.6, any perturbed equations associated with Eq.(29)

$$u_{xt} = u + \frac{1}{6}(u^3)_{xx} + \epsilon f(x, t, u), \tag{30}$$

with arbitrary function $f(x, t, u)$, is not approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint in the sense of Definition 2.2. However, Eq.(29) is nonlinearly self-adjoint under the differential substitution $v = u_t - \frac{1}{2}u^2 u_x$ [6].

As illustrated by short pulse equation, there exist some PDEs which are not approximately nonlinearly self-adjoint in the sense of Definition 2.2 but with a general definition of (approximate) nonlinear self-adjointness such as differential substitution, thus it may consider the extended substitutions such as differential substitution containing first-order or higher-order derivatives. We will report these results in the forthcoming papers.

References

[1] M. J. Ablowitz and P. A. Clarkson, *Solitons, Nonlinear Evolution Equations and Inverse Scattering*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 149, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

[2] E. Noether, Invariante Variationsprobleme, Nachr. König. Gissell. Wissen., Göttingen, Math.-Phys. Kl. 2 (1918) 235-257, English transl.: Transport Theory Statist. Phys. 1 (1971) 186-207.

[3] S.C. Anco and G.W. Bluman, Direct construction method for conservation laws of partial differential equations, part I: examples of conservation law classifications, Eur. J. Appl. Math. 13 (2002) 545-566

[4] S.C. Anco and G.W. Bluman, Direct construction method for conservation laws of partial differential equations, part II: general treatment, Eur. J. Appl. Math. 9 (2002) 567-585.

[5] A.H. Kara, F.M. Mahomed, Noether-type symmetries and conservation laws via partial Lagrangians, Nonlinear Dyn. 5 (2006) 367-383.

[6] N.H. Ibragimov, Nonlinear self-adjointness in constructing conservation laws, Archives of ALGA,1-99, Volume 7/8, 2010-2011.

[7] N.H. Ibragimov, Nonlinear self-adjointness and conservation laws, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44 (2011) 432002 (8pp).

[8] M. Torrisi and R. Tracinà, Quasi self-adjointness of a class of third order nonlinear dispersive equations, Nonlin. Anal., RWA, DOI: 10.1016/j.nonrwa.2012.10.013, 2012.

[9] M.L. Gandarias and M. Bruzón, Some conservation laws for a forced KdV equation, Nonlin. Anal., RWA, 13 (2012) 2692-2700.

[10] I.L. Freire and J.C.S. Sampaio, Nonlinear self-adjointness of a generalized fifth-order KdV equation, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 45 (2012) 032001 (7pp)

[11] N.H. Ibragimov, M. Torrisi and R. Tracinà, Self-adjointness and conservation laws of a generalized Burgers equation, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. 44 (2011) 145201 (5pp).

[12] I.L. Freire, New classes of nonlinearly self-adjoint evolution equations of third- and fifth-order, Commun. Nonlin. Sci. Num. Simul. 18 (2013) 493-499.

[13] M.L. Gandarias, Weak self-adjoint differential equations, J. Phys. A. 44 (2011) 262001 (6pp).

[14] V.A. Baikov, R.K. Gazizov and N.H. Ibragimov, Perturbation methods in group analysis, J. Soviet. Math. 55 (1991) 1450-1490.

[15] W.I. Fushchich and W.H. Shtelen, On approximate symmetry and approximate solutions of the non-linear wave equation with a small parameter, J. Phys. A 22 (18) (1989) L887-L890.

[16] A.H. Kara, F.M. Mahomed and G. Ünal, Approximate symmetries and conservation laws with applications, Int. J. Theoret. Phys. 38 (1999) 2389-2399.

[17] A.G. Johnpillai, A.H. Kara and F.M. Mahomed, A basis of approximate conservation laws for PDEs with a small parameter, Int. J. Nonlinear Mech. 41 (2006) 830-837.

[18] A.G. Johnpillai, A.H. Kara and F.M. Mahomed, Approximate Noether-type symmetries and conservation laws via partial Lagrangians for PDEs with a small parameter, J. Comput. Appl. Math. 223 (2009) 508-518.

[19] Z.Y. Zhang, Approximate nonlinear self-adjointness and approximate conservation laws.

[20] V.A. Baikov, R.K. Gazizov, N.H. Ibragimov, in: N.H. Ibragimov (Ed.), Handbook of Lie Group Analysis of Differential Equations, vol. 3, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 1996.

[21] N.H. Ibragimov, A new conservation theorem, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 333 (2007) 311-328.

[22] A.G. Johnpillai and A.H. Kara, Variational Formulation of Approximate Symmetries and Conservation Laws, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 40 (2001) 1501-1509.

[23] I.A. Charnyi, Unstable Motion of a Real Fluid in Pipes, Nedra, Moscow 1975 (in Russian).

[24] Z.Y. Zhang and Y.F. Chen, A comparative study of approximate symmetry and approximate homotopy symmetry to a class of perturbed nonlinear wave equation, Nonlinear Anal. 74 (2011) 4300-4318.

[25] T. Schäfer and C. Wayne, Propagation of ultra-short optical pulses in cubic nonlinear media, Physica D, 196 (2004) 90-105.